SECURITATEA ECOLOGICĂ: RECONFIGURAREA GUVERNANȚEI DE MEDIU PENTRU O LUME INSTABILĂ DIN PERSPECIVĂ CLIMATICĂ

ECOLOGICAL SECURITY: REFRAMING ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE FOR A CLIMATE-UNSTABLE WORLD

Luminița DIACONU, *doctor, lector universitar,*
Academia de Studii Economice a Moldovei
E-mail: lumidiaconu74@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6736-6344

CZU: 574:[504:551.583](478)
https://doi.org/10.53783/snierm2025.16

Rezumat. *Criza climatică accelerată remodelează parametrii securității globale și regionale, transformând degradarea ecologică într-o amenințare multidimensională ce destabilizează economiile, instituțiile și sistemele sociale. Această lucrare susține că controlul ecologic, înțeles în mod tradițional ca un mecanism de reglementare și supraveghere în cadrul protecției mediului, trebuie să evolueze într-un instrument de guvernanță strategică central pentru atingerea securității ecologice. Printr-o analiză conceptuală și juridică integrată, studiul demonstrează modul în care controlul ecologic poate funcționa ca un cadru anticipativ, de construire a rezilienței, capabil să atenueze riscurile induse de climă înainte ca acestea să escaladeze în crize politice sau umanitare. Bazându-se pe practici europene comparative, teoria sistemelor și literatura de securitate, lucrarea reconceptualizează controlul ecologic ca o arhitectură de guvernanță preventivă bazată pe monitorizare, detectarea rapidă a riscurilor, aplicarea transparentă a legii și coordonarea intersectorială. Domenii cheie, cum ar fi guvernanța apei, degradarea terenurilor, pierderea biodiversității și poluarea industrială, sunt examinate pentru a arăta cum eșecurile sistemelor de control subminează direct stabilitatea ecologică. Lucrarea se finalizează cu o concluzie conform căreea consolidarea controlului ecologic, prin instrumente digitale de monitorizare, și planificarea bazată pe scenarii și cooperare instituțională pe mai multe niveluri, oferă statelor o cale realistă pentru protejarea securității ecologice într-o lume instabilă din punct de vedere climatic. Argumentul poziționează controlul ecologic nu doar ca o funcție birocratică, ci și ca un pilon esențial al rezilienței naționale și al politicii de securitate de lungă durată.*

Cuvinte-cheie*: securitate ecologică, control ecologic, guvernanță a schimbărilor climatice, sustenabilitate, politica de mediu a UE*

Abstract*. The accelerating climate crisis is reshaping the parameters of global and regional security, transforming ecological degradation into a multidimensional threat that destabilizes economies, institutions, and social systems. This paper argues that ecological control—traditionally understood as a regulatory and supervisory mechanism within environmental protection—must evolve into a strategic governance instrument central to achieving ecological security. Through an integrated conceptual and legal analysis, the study demonstrates how ecological control can function as an anticipatory, resilience-building*

framework capable of mitigating climate-induced risks before they escalate into political or humanitarian crises. Drawing on comparative European practices, systems theory, and security literature, the paper reconceptualizes ecological control as a preventive governance architecture grounded in monitoring, rapid risk detection, transparent enforcement, and cross-sectoral coordination. Key domains such as water governance, land degradation, biodiversity loss, and industrial pollution are examined to show how failures in control systems directly undermine ecological stability. The paper concludes that strengthening ecological control—through digital monitoring tools, scenario-based planning, and multi-level institutional cooperation—offers states a realistic pathway for safeguarding ecological security in a climate-unstable world. The argument positions ecological control not merely as a bureaucratic function but as an essential pillar of national resilience and long-term security policy.

Key words: *ecological security, ecological control, climate change governance, sustainability, EU Environmental Policy*

1. Introduction

Climate change has transformed environmental degradation from an ecological challenge into a profound security threat [29]. As droughts disrupt food systems, floods destabilize infrastructure, and resource scarcity triggers social and political tensions, the parameters of security itself are shifting [22]. Within this evolving landscape, traditional systems of ecological control, designed mainly for compliance checking, administrative supervision, and sanctioning, are no longer adequate [51]. They react to environmental damage after it occurs rather than preventing it [32].

This article proposes a conceptual and operational transformation: ecological control must evolve into a strategic tool for achieving ecological security [50]. Rather than functioning at the periphery of public administration, ecological control should serve as a central mechanism for monitoring systemic environmental risks, anticipating climate-induced shocks, and supporting resilience-oriented national governance [44]. Drawing from European comparative practice, systems theory, and security studies, the article demonstrates that modernized ecological control offers states a realistic pathway to prevent environmental degradation from escalating into broader socio-economic and political crises [30].

2. Conceptual Framework

Research on ecological security has expanded considerably over the past two decades, driven by interdisciplinary contributions in security studies, environmental governance, and climate-risk analysis [47]. Scholars increasingly view climate change as a "risk multiplier" that amplifies existing vulnerabilities in governance, economy, and social cohesion [2].

Parallel to this, literature on ecological control, particularly in Eastern Europe, remains rooted in administrative law, focusing on inspections, sanctions, and compliance. However, contemporary studies argue for a shift toward preventive, data-

driven, and system-integrated environmental oversight [7]. Despite these advancements, few publications explicitly connect ecological control to ecological security. This article fills that gap by synthesizing insights from environmental law, security studies, and ecological systems science to propose a modern governance framework where ecological control functions as an instrument for national and regional security [45].

2.1. Ecological Security: Theoretical Evolution

The concept of ecological security has travelled an interesting intellectual path. Initially, it emerged at the margins of environmental policy debates, treated more as a normative aspiration than a structured analytical lens. Early interpretations framed ecological security primarily as protection from acute ecological disruptions, pollution incidents, industrial accidents, or ecosystem degradation that threatened human well-being. This view remained largely anthropocentric: nature was secure insofar as it protected society.

By the late 20th century, however, ecological security became intertwined with global security thinking. Scholars such as Homer-Dixon and Dalby [12] argued that environmental degradation, resource scarcity, and climate change were not only ecological concerns but potential catalysts for conflict, displacement, and state fragility [43]. This shift re-positioned ecological security as a structural condition underpinning political, economic, and societal stability. The academic conversation began to acknowledge that environmental systems do not merely support human activities, they *shape* them, often deterministically.

In contemporary debates, ecological security is approached as an integrated condition where ecosystems, social institutions, and governance arrangements co-produce resilience. This evolution, from defensive approaches to systemic understandings, underpins the conceptual grounding of this paper. Ecological control becomes one of the key mechanisms through which ecological security is operationalized, though not always effectively.

2.2. Classical vs. Modern Approaches to Ecological Control

Traditionally, ecological control was designed as a command-and-control mechanism that emphasized compliance with environmental standards. Inspectors verified emissions, audit reports, and conformity with permits. In this classical model, the focus lay on detecting infringements and sanctioning responsible actors. Its strengths were clarity and legal predictability, but its limitations soon became evident: it was reactive, slow, and poorly adapted to complex ecological dynamics [41].

Modern approaches have significantly expanded the scope of ecological control. Today, control mechanisms incorporate continuous monitoring, performance-based

indicators, economic instruments, and participatory governance elements. Technological innovations, from satellite remote sensing to real-time water quality sensors, have transformed State control into a hybrid practice that blends regulatory oversight with risk forecasting.

However, the transition remains incomplete. Many legal systems, especially in developing and transition economies, still rely on classical supervision while attempting to integrate modern risk-based governance. This inconsistency produces institutional friction: the law may appear modern, while enforcement practices remain anchored in outdated paradigms. Understanding this duality is essential for interpreting why ecological control often fails to deliver ecological stability.

2.3. Systems Theory and Risk Governance Perspectives

Systems theory provides a powerful lens for understanding ecological control as part of a wider socio-ecological system. Instead of viewing environmental problems as isolated violations, this framework highlights interdependence: pollution in one basin affects downstream communities; forest loss alters hydrological cycles; governance gaps reverberate across sectors. Within a systems-theoretical perspective, ecological control is a feedback mechanism, an institutional "sensor" that detects disturbances and sends corrective signals [47].

Risk governance expands this idea by acknowledging that uncertainty, nonlinearity, and cumulative impacts define modern environmental challenges. Scholars such as Renn and Klinke emphasize that risks cannot be managed solely through expost sanctions; they require anticipatory strategies, multi-stakeholder involvement, and adaptive governance [13]. Ecological control, therefore, must function not only as a supervisory tool but also as an early-warning mechanism capable of interpreting complex signals.

This shift redefines the expectations placed on environmental institutions. Instead of policing discrete infractions, control authorities must navigate diffuse, long-term risks whose sources are distributed and sometimes invisible [40]. Climate change exemplifies this challenge, transforming ecological control into a domain where scientific uncertainty and institutional responsibility intersect.

2.4. The Climate-Security Nexus as Structural Context

The climate-security nexus situates ecological control within a broader geopolitical and socio-economic reality. Climate change acts not only as an ecological phenomenon but as a structural stressor for governance systems. Rising temperatures, extreme weather, and hydrological variability intensify pressures on State institutions already struggling with limited resources, fragmented competencies, or outdated monitoring systems [1].

At the same time, climate impacts can produce destabilizing ripple effects, food insecurity, migration, economic stress, that further weaken institutional capacities. Thus, ecological control operates within a context marked by stress multipliers: ecological degradation interacts with governance fragility, and climate risks expose systemic vulnerabilities.

Understanding ecological control through the climate-security nexus helps explain why even well-designed regulatory frameworks may underperform. Without institutional resilience, adaptive capacity, and cross-sectoral coordination, the system cannot translate ecological control into ecological stability.

3. The Gap Between Ecological Control and Ecological Stability

In the era of accelerating climate change, maintaining ecological stability depends on the capacity of ecological control systems to anticipate and prevent environmental degradation before it becomes irreversible. However, comparative European and transboundary experiences reveal significant gaps between legal frameworks, effective monitoring, and enforcement, which limit the effectiveness of ecological control and undermine socio-ecological resilience. Four critical dimensions of this gap are discussed below.

3.1. Regulatory Gaps and Incomplete Monitoring

One of the most persistent obstacles to achieving ecological stability is the presence of regulatory blind spots and incomplete monitoring. Many environmental laws were designed with static thresholds or narrow sectoral focus, failing to account for cumulative impacts, cross-border pollution, or climate-driven variability. In practice, monitoring systems often remain fragmented, underfunded, or reliant on outdated technology, resulting in incomplete or delayed information.

European examples demonstrate both challenges and opportunities. The EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) sets a comprehensive framework for monitoring water quality and assessing the ecological status of river basins. Yet implementation varies across member states due to differing capacities and resource availability. For instance, in the Danube River Basin, nutrient loading and certain pollutants were detected only after reaching near-critical levels, revealing gaps in early warning and real-time monitoring. This paradox illustrates a key problem: agencies may comply with the law formally, yet fail to detect early signs of ecological decline [1]

Incomplete monitoring does more than reduce data quality; it also erodes institutional credibility. An unstable ecosystem, where warning signals are overlooked, generates social and economic risks that can rapidly escalate into local or regional crises. Proactive, integrated, and interoperable monitoring systems are essential to close this gap, linking agencies across sectors, regions, and borders [4].

3.2. Enforcement Deficits and Compliance Failures

Even robust legal frameworks cannot guarantee ecological stability if enforcement is weak. Deficits in enforcement may arise from limited institutional capacity, political interference, economic pressures, or inconsistent sanctioning practices. Across Europe, inspectors are often overburdened, under-trained, or constrained by procedural requirements that limit fieldwork and reduce responsiveness.

Compliance failures occur not only through deliberate avoidance but also due to the technical complexity of environmental obligations. Small and medium enterprises (SMEs) may lack the technical knowledge or financial capacity to meet emission standards, while large industrial operators can exploit procedural loopholes or negotiate politically favorable outcomes. For example, in certain transboundary industrial zones, uneven enforcement across neighboring countries created regulatory arbitrage, allowing continued pollution that undermined local water quality [39].

When enforcement is uneven, ecological control loses its deterrent effect. The result is a governance environment in which compliance is optional and ecological degradation persists unchecked. Conversely, harmonized enforcement, such as joint inspections and shared sanctions in the Rhine River Basin, demonstrates that coordinated action can substantially reduce violations and promote mutual accountability.

3.3. Fragmented Governance and Sectoral Silos

Ecological systems do not respect administrative boundaries, yet institutions often do. Fragmented governance, where water authorities, forestry agencies, climate departments, and local administrations operate in isolated silos, weakens environmental control. Information sharing is limited, responsibilities overlap or conflict, and strategic coordination is rare [5].

This fragmentation hampers systemic responses. A river basin may be managed by multiple institutions with incompatible mandates; climate adaptation strategies may not be integrated with land-use planning; pollution events can fall "between the cracks" of jurisdictional boundaries [38]. Accountability becomes diluted, and reaction times slow, undermining effective ecological control.

European examples show the benefits of integrated governance. The International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR) coordinates multiple countries to manage water resources and protect biodiversity across national borders. Regular data exchange, joint planning exercises, and conflict resolution mechanisms build trust and facilitate coordinated responses. Such experiences demonstrate that ecological control, when embedded in integrated governance frameworks, can serve as a stabilizing force for regional security [6].

3.4. Climate Change as a Stress Multiplier for Institutional Weakness

Climate change intensifies all structural weaknesses in ecological control. It increases the frequency of extreme weather events, accelerates environmental degradation, and introduces new variables that traditional control mechanisms were never designed to handle. These pressures stretch institutional capacities already operating at the limits of their resources [8].

For example, traditional water monitoring systems cannot capture rapid hydrological changes, while rigid permitting frameworks struggle to accommodate climate-driven fluctuations in emissions or resource use. Climate-induced stresses also exacerbate socio-economic pressures, diverting political attention and public resources away from long-term environmental governance.

Transboundary experiences illustrate these dynamics vividly. In the Dniester River Basin, rising temperatures and fluctuating precipitation patterns have compounded pre-existing challenges in water quality management and resource allocation, exposing vulnerabilities in both Moldovan and Ukrainian institutions [8]. Without adaptive, systems-based governance, these weaknesses amplify the gap between ecological control as a legal instrument and ecological stability as a tangible outcome [37].

In summary, the combination of regulatory gaps, weak enforcement, fragmented governance, and climate pressures produces a cumulative effect: ecological control, while formally in place, often fails to deliver actual stability. Lessons from European and transboundary practices highlight the importance of transforming reactive, fragmented systems into anticipatory, integrated, and cooperative governance networks [10]. Continuous monitoring, early warning systems, harmonized standards, and cross-border collaboration are essential to transform ecological control into a genuine tool for resilience and the prevention of environmental and socio-political crises.

4. Why Ecological Control Fails to Deliver Ecological Stability: Structural, Legal, and Institutional Determinants

Ecological stability is often assumed to naturally follow from effective ecological control, as if rigorous monitoring and well-crafted regulations automatically ensure healthy, resilient ecosystems. Reality, however, tells a different story. States may operate fully functional environmental inspectorates, issue thousands of permits each year, and conduct hundreds of audits, while ecosystems continue to degrade. This paradox requires a deeper examination of the structural, legal, and institutional determinants that decouple ecological control from actual ecological stability [11].

Stability in ecological systems is inherently systemic, shaped by cumulative pressures, governance coherence, socio-economic dynamics, climate variability, and

institutional capacity. Ecological control is only one component of this complex system, and too often it is configured in ways that constrain rather than support adaptive, resilient governance.

4.1. Structural Determinants: Complexity, Scale, and Cumulative Impacts

Modern ecosystems are affected by disturbances that are non-linear, cumulative, and often invisible until critical thresholds are crossed. Ecological control mechanisms, however, were designed in an era when environmental challenges were simpler and more localized: pollution from a single facility, wastewater from a specific city, or emissions from a well-defined industrial source [13]. Its logic remains rooted in single-source verification.

Today, ecosystem degradation arises from the interaction of multiple pressures: agricultural runoff and diffuse nutrient pollution, deforestation and land fragmentation, chemical mixtures with poorly understood cumulative toxicity, climate-induced hydrological variability, cross-border industrial impacts, and urban expansion that seals soils [36]. These stresses combine in ways that classical inspection frameworks cannot adequately capture. Control institutions continue to check compliance with individual standards, while ecological stability depends on aggregated system-wide conditions. This mismatch is structural: twenty-first-century environmental problems operate at scales that exceed the original institutional tools [62].

Moreover, ecological processes unfold over long time horizons. Seasonal river transformations, slow soil degradation, and biodiversity loss may progress over decades, whereas inspections and permitting cycles often operate on annual or triennial schedules. This temporal mismatch further weakens the link between control and stability.

4.2. Legal Determinants: Static Norms in a Dynamic Environment

Environmental law is inherently conservative. It relies on fixed thresholds, standardized emission limits, and administrative procedures that ensure predictability and legal certainty. While these features are essential, they also introduce rigidity [61].

Many environmental standards were developed based on historical climatic conditions and ecosystem baselines that are rapidly changing. Water quality norms, hydrological flow indicators, air pollution dispersion models, and soil load capacities were calibrated for a world that no longer exists. As climate patterns shift, the reference frameworks embedded in legal norms remain static. Consequently, “acceptable” emission levels may no longer be ecologically safe; hydropower and water abstraction permits may destabilize altered river flows; agricultural nutrient standards may misalign with climate-driven runoff; protected areas may not reflect new species migration patterns [14].

Administrative procedures—environmental impact assessments, strategic assessments, permitting processes, periodic reporting, and public consultations, become overloaded with formal steps that dilute substantive outcomes. Inspectors may review hundreds of pages of documentation yet have limited time for field verification. Compliance becomes procedural rather than ecological, and law functions more as a box-checking exercise than as a guarantee of ecosystem stability [60].

Legal fragmentation further complicates matters. Environmental legislation is often compartmentalized across water, forests, climate, chemicals, waste, biodiversity, and land-use laws, each reflecting distinct policy logics, histories, and administrative cultures. Lack of harmonization generates gaps, overlaps, and inconsistencies that ecological control must navigate. Control becomes a patchwork of sector-specific checks that fails to account for cross-sector ecological interactions [52].

4.3. Institutional Determinants: Capacity, Coordination, and Culture

Even the most carefully designed legal frameworks require competent institutions to interpret, implement, and enforce them. In many countries, environmental authorities face persistent capacity deficits. Limited budgets, understaffed inspectorates, outdated monitoring equipment, high personnel turnover, and heavy administrative workloads reduce inspectors' ability to conduct meaningful fieldwork, invest in modern monitoring technologies, or develop specialized expertise in areas such as climate risk modeling, hydrochemical analysis, or biodiversity assessment [15].

Coordination among agencies is also a major challenge [31]. Water authorities, forestry agencies, climate departments, municipal administrations, and sometimes public health offices share responsibilities for environmental outcomes, but collaboration is often ad hoc or unstructured. Information flows are slow, competences overlap, and institutional cultures differ. One agency may detect early signs of ecological stress, yet the lack of coordination prevents timely collective action, turning systemic risks into institutional blind spots [59].

Compliance culture and political priorities further influence effectiveness. Industries critical for employment or strategic infrastructure may receive regulatory leniency. Local authorities may hesitate to sanction major taxpayers. Informal agreements or negotiated compliance sometimes replace strict enforcement [35]. Weak compliance culture diminishes the credibility of ecological control, undermining both deterrence and ecological stability.

4.4. Adaptive Governance Deficits

Ecological stability requires adaptive governance, the capacity to learn, adjust, and reform based on new information. Many systems lack robust feedback and adaptation mechanisms. Inspection findings, monitoring reports, and scientific studies

often remain siloed and rarely inform strategic reviews or adjustments to policy objectives and legal thresholds [58].

Policy cycles are slow, while ecological degradation and climate impacts accelerate annually [28]. Predictive modeling, early-warning systems, and scenario simulations are underutilized. Control institutions rely predominantly on retrospective assessments rather than forward-looking analyses, deepening the gap between ecological control and ecological stability [52].

In conclusion, the inability of ecological control to generate ecological stability is not the result of a single flaw but of an interrelated set of structural, legal, and institutional determinants. Modern ecosystems operate under complex, climate-stressed conditions, while environmental law and control mechanisms remain anchored in outdated paradigms. Until ecological control evolves into a dynamic, integrated, and anticipatory governance system, ecological stability will remain a distant, elusive goal.

5. Pathways for Strengthening the Ecological Control–Ecological Security Nexus

The widening gap between ecological control and ecological stability, highlighted in the previous section, is not an inevitable consequence of environmental governance, it reflects institutional inertia, outdated legal frameworks, fragmented governance, and the escalating pressures of climate change [16]. These weaknesses, however, also reveal the points at which transformative interventions can take hold. Strengthening the ecological control–ecological security nexus requires a forward-looking, adaptive, and integrated approach, one that aligns regulatory, institutional, and technological capacities with the realities of a warming world.

To achieve this, four interrelated pathways emerge: structural and systemic reforms, legal and regulatory innovation, institutional capacity building and governance integration, and climate-responsive governance adjustments. While each pathway addresses a distinct dimension of ecological security, together they form a cohesive strategy capable of sustaining ecological stability under climate stress [57].

5.1. Reframing Ecological Control Through Systemic and Integrated Approaches

A central challenge of modern environmental governance lies in the mismatch between the complexity of ecological systems and the simplicity of existing control mechanisms. Traditional ecological control focuses largely on compliance enforcement: verifying adherence to specific standards and sanctioning violations [27]. While enforcement remains essential, it is no longer sufficient in the face of cumulative, cross-sectoral, and climate-amplified environmental pressures.

Modern ecological control must evolve toward a stewardship model. Inspectors and agencies should act as monitors of overall ecosystem health, risk managers, facilitators of adaptive responses, and mediators of cross-sectoral solutions. This transformation entails embedding ecological control into long-term strategic planning, resource management policies, and climate adaptation frameworks. Rather than merely reacting to infractions, agencies must anticipate system-level risks and guide interventions before ecological thresholds are breached.

Cumulative and cross-sectoral assessment tools are pivotal to this shift. Environmental degradation rarely results from a single activity; it emerges from the aggregation of pressures across agriculture, industry, transport, energy, and forestry [2]. To address this, ecological control should incorporate landscape-level monitoring, ecosystem-based management, and cumulative impact assessment. Examples include assessing nutrient loading at the scale of entire river basins, tracking air pollution as a multi-source atmospheric system, evaluating biodiversity loss across interconnected habitats, and mapping land-use changes at watershed or regional scales. Such systemic approaches better reflect the interdependencies that define ecological stability.

Equally critical is the integration of science and predictive modeling into ecological control. Early-warning systems, hydrological simulations, climate impact projections, and biodiversity decline models can identify risks long before they materialize as ecological crises. By incorporating these tools, ecological control can shift from a retrospective auditing function to a proactive, forward-looking platform for environmental risk governance [14].

5.2. Legal and Regulatory Tools for Adaptive, Climate-Aligned Governance

Environmental law, as it currently stands, is one of the primary limitations on ecological control. Rigid thresholds, static norms, and slow adaptation cycles often prevent institutions from responding effectively to changing ecological realities [25]. Redesigning the legal architecture to accommodate flexibility and climate alignment is therefore crucial.

Adaptive legal standards and dynamic thresholds allow laws to respond to variability in climate conditions and shifting ecological baselines. Examples include seasonal or climate-adjusted water abstraction limits, pollutant thresholds that vary with river flow or temperature, biodiversity protection measures that adjust to species migration, and soil nutrient standards calibrated to precipitation patterns. Precedents exist in fisheries management and biodiversity policies, offering models for broader adoption [17].

Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) and permitting processes must also evolve from procedural formalities into instruments of adaptive governance. SEAs should be linked directly to climate adaptation planning, incorporate cumu-

lative and transboundary impacts, establish ecological risk thresholds that trigger mandatory permit revisions, and embed real-time monitoring obligations. Permits should become living documents that evolve in tandem with scientific knowledge and environmental conditions [5].

Legal harmonization is another priority. Sectoral fragmentation, where water, land, climate, forest, and biodiversity laws operate in isolation, creates contradictions, gaps, and enforcement challenges. Harmonizing definitions of ecological risk, establishing cross-referenced obligations, and creating joint regulatory mechanisms for overlapping areas such as wetlands or river basins enhances coherence, reduces governance gaps, and strengthens ecological stability.

5.3. Institutional Capacity and Governance Innovation

Even the most sophisticated legal frameworks will fail if institutions lack the capacity to implement them effectively [24]. Strengthening ecological control as a driver of ecological security requires modern, agile, and well-resourced institutions.

Environmental inspectorates must be modernized [16]. This includes increasing staff and specialized expertise, equipping agencies with remote sensing technologies, drones, and real-time sensors, digitalizing inspection and data management processes, and enhancing staff training in climate risk modeling, ecological assessment, and integrated planning. A modern inspectorate is not merely a compliance body; it is a knowledge-driven, technologically competent organization capable of interpreting complex environmental data [13].

Cross-sectoral coordination is equally essential. Ecological stability arises from the combined efforts of ministries of environment, agriculture, energy, water, interior, and emergency services. Establishing ecosystem management councils or environmental-security coordination platforms facilitates real-time data sharing, joint risk assessments, coordinated responses, and integrated climate-resilient strategies. This is particularly important in transboundary contexts such as the Dniester Basin, where ecological risks traverse national borders and require cooperative oversight [56].

Strengthening governance at the local level is another key element. Local authorities often lack resources or autonomy, yet their decisions directly influence soil health, water quality, and biodiversity. Solutions include devolving targeted competencies, establishing community monitoring programs, and funding local environmental units with dedicated resources [4]. Empowered local actors enhance the operational reach and responsiveness of ecological control systems.

5.4. Climate-Responsive Governance and Risk Anticipation

Climate change intensifies ecological pressures, exposes institutional weaknesses, and generates new risks that conventional control mechanisms cannot han-

dle. Incorporating climate-sensitive approaches into ecological control is therefore indispensable [23].

Inspection schedules should account for climate variability, prioritizing monitoring during droughts, peak runoff periods, or wildfire seasons. Early-warning systems should integrate climate risk indicators such as drought indices, heatwave stress maps, water scarcity triggers, wildfire probability, and flood projections. Such integrated monitoring enables timely interventions, mitigating ecological and security risks simultaneously [17].

Finally, ecological control agencies should play an active role in national climate adaptation strategies, using field data and monitoring capacity to inform policy adjustments, guide resource allocation, and ensure that adaptation measures are grounded in observable ecological trends. By linking ecological control directly to climate resilience, states create a dynamic governance loop that simultaneously protects ecosystems and enhances societal security [55].

As a result, bridging the gap between ecological control and ecological security requires more than incremental improvements; it demands a transformation in the conceptualization and practice of environmental governance. By adopting systemic and integrated approaches, embedding adaptive regulatory frameworks, modernizing institutions, and incorporating climate responsiveness into all aspects of environmental oversight, states can reposition ecological control as a strategic driver of ecological stability. This transformation is not merely an environmental imperative—it is foundational to national resilience, human well-being, and long-term ecological security.

6. Integrating Ecological Security and Ecological Control: Pathways for a Coherent Governance Model

The accelerating pace of climate change has revealed a foundational paradox in environmental governance: ecological security is increasingly recognized as a strategic priority at the highest political levels, yet ecological control, the operational backbone of inspections, monitoring, and regulatory enforcement, remains technically, institutionally, and conceptually detached from it. This decoupling significantly limits states' capacity to anticipate, mitigate, and respond to ecological risks that increasingly shape human well-being, economic stability, and regional security [17].

To bridge this gap, ecological security cannot rely on high-level strategic visions alone; it requires an operational backbone rooted in coherent, modernized, and climate-responsive ecological control systems [48]. The following pathways outline concrete measures for achieving this integration, transforming ecological control from a reactive, bureaucratic function into a proactive, strategic pillar of national and transboundary ecological security [19].

6.1. Reframing Ecological Control as a Strategic Security Function

The first step toward integration is conceptual. Historically, ecological control has been perceived as a bureaucratic or administrative mechanism focused on compliance verification, documentation review, and post-factum enforcement. While these functions remain important, in the context of climate change they are directly linked to national resilience and long-term ecological stability.

Reframing ecological control as a security function requires acknowledging that environmental violations contribute to cumulative ecological stress, which in turn increases systemic vulnerability and undermines both national and regional security. Recognizing environmental inspectorates, monitoring agencies, and regulatory bodies as critical infrastructure, alongside health systems, energy grids, and civil protection services, can elevate their institutional status, attract technical expertise, secure funding, and encourage cross-sectoral cooperation.

This paradigm shift also transforms ecological control from a reactive tool into a proactive and predictive mechanism, where interventions anticipate environmental risks rather than respond to crises after they occur. Inspectorates thus become active stewards of ecological stability rather than mere enforcers of compliance [42].

6.2. Strengthening Data Systems for Early Warning and Predictive Control

A critical component of operationalizing ecological security is robust, real-time data systems. Traditional inspection cycles and complaint-driven models are inadequate for climate-driven risks, which evolve rapidly and interact across ecological, social, and economic systems.

National environmental data platforms must evolve into integrated real-time monitoring systems, leveraging satellite observation, sensor networks, AI-assisted biodiversity tracking, and climate-risk dashboards [21]. Predictive analytics should guide inspection priorities, enabling agencies to focus on regions or facilities where violations are statistically more likely under specific climatic conditions, such as drought-induced groundwater extraction or industrial discharges during heatwaves.

Risk-tiered ecological control, which prioritizes inspections based on environmental and security relevance rather than fixed schedules, exemplifies best practice. Countries such as the Netherlands and Finland already deploy such systems, while the European Environment Agency provides integrated data ecosystems linking climate risk indicators to governance actions [19]. For states like Moldova, EU neighborhood funding, digital transition initiatives, and Horizon Europe partnerships could help build predictive monitoring capacity, transforming ecological control into a forward-looking risk governance platform [50].

6.3. Institutional Integration: Linking Environmental Agencies, Security Actors, and Local Authorities

Achieving ecological security requires holistic government coordination. In many countries, environmental institutions remain isolated from sectors managing risk, national security, emergency response, and local governance [33].

Integration involves multiple layers: environmental agencies must participate in national security planning, including representation on national security councils, disaster risk committees, transboundary water commissions, and strategic foresight units. Climate–security task forces can facilitate joint scenario planning, training, and emergency response coordination, involving environmental inspectorates, hydrometeorological services, ministries of interior and defense, civil protection agencies, and local authorities [54].

Local authorities, often the first to detect environmental stress signals such as illegal dumping or small-scale deforestation, require decentralized powers supported by national guidance and digital reporting tools. Cross-sectoral training enhances shared understanding: inspectors learn risk governance principles while security personnel gain knowledge of ecological indicators. Integration ensures ecological intelligence informs strategic decisions, creating a functional bridge between operational control and strategic security.

6.4. Embedding Climate Adaptation into Regulatory Enforcement

Environmental regulations often assume climatic stability, with fixed thresholds for emissions, water extraction, or biodiversity impacts. Climate change undermines these assumptions, making adaptive enforcement essential [19].

Environmental permits should include climate-sensitive thresholds, adjusting water abstraction limits or pollutant discharge standards according to seasonal or projected climatic conditions [34]. Inspections must evaluate both regulatory compliance and ecological viability under expected climate scenarios. Emergency powers should allow rapid adjustments during extreme events, such as heatwaves, floods, or droughts. Facilities with high ecological footprints should also adopt adaptation measures, including cleaner technologies, water recycling, energy efficiency improvements, and resilience infrastructure [26].

Embedding climate adaptation into enforcement aligns micro-level regulatory actions with macro-level ecological security objectives, ensuring that ecological control is responsive to dynamic environmental realities [21].

6.5. Enhancing Public Participation and Societal Trust

No model of ecological security can succeed without societal engagement and transparency. Public trust and community involvement strengthen compliance, pro-

vide early-warning insights, and enhance the credibility of institutions.

Citizen-reporting platforms, open data portals, and community-based biodiversity monitoring serve as extensions of official inspection systems. Public access to inspection results, pollution data, and enforcement outcomes reinforces legitimacy. Participatory permitting, public hearings, and co-management of protected areas foster shared responsibility and reduce potential conflicts, particularly in transboundary or contested regions [49].

By embedding ecological control within a broader participatory ecological security framework, states can harness local knowledge, improve compliance, and cultivate a culture of proactive stewardship, transforming communities from passive observers into active partners in ecological governance [46].

Integrating ecological security and ecological control requires a multi-dimensional transformation: reframing ecological control as a strategic security function, building predictive and adaptive data systems, linking environmental and security institutions, embedding climate adaptation in regulatory enforcement, and enhancing public participation. Together, these measures create a coherent, resilient governance model capable of anticipating and mitigating ecological risks, sustaining ecosystem stability, and strengthening national and transboundary security in an era of climate volatility [53].

7. Conclusions

In the climate change era, ecological security and ecological control are no longer separate analytical or institutional domains—they are interdependent pillars of modern environmental governance. Ecological security sets the strategic horizon: protecting ecosystems as the foundation of societal resilience, peace, and long-term development. Ecological control provides the operational vehicle: the inspections, monitoring, data systems, enforcement mechanisms, and participatory processes that translate strategy into daily practice.

Yet in many states, including Moldova, the two are still disconnected. This disconnect creates blind spots in risk management, weakens early-warning capacities, and allows ecological degradation to accumulate until it becomes a socioeconomic or geopolitical crisis. The way forward requires a deliberate and structural integration.

- Ecological control must be re-framed as a security function, not merely an administrative one.
- Data-driven, predictive monitoring systems must replace outdated, cyclical inspection models.
- Institutions responsible for environmental protection must be fully included in national security architectures.

- Regulatory enforcement must adapt to changing climatic conditions, rather than relying on static thresholds.
- Public participation must be strengthened to build social trust, improve detection capacity, and support compliance.

Together, these shifts represent not a cosmetic reform, but a profound modernization of environmental governance. They align everyday regulatory work with the strategic imperatives of climate adaptation, risk reduction, and societal resilience.

Ultimately, integrating ecological control with ecological security is not simply a policy choice; it is an existential necessity. As climate change accelerates, the states and regions that succeed will be those that recognize ecological protection as a cornerstone of security and that build governance systems capable of anticipating, preventing, and managing ecological risks before they destabilize societies.

Bibliographical references:

1. ADGER, W. N. Vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change, 16*(3), 2006, p. 268–281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.02.006 (Visited in 01.12.2025).
2. ADGER, W. N., BARNETT, J., BROWN, K., MARSHALL, N., O'Brien, K. Cultural dimensions of climate change impacts and adaptation. *Nature Climate Change, 3*(2), 2013, p. 112–117. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1666 (Visited in 01.12.2025).
3. BENSON, M., LORENZONI, I. *Climate Change and Security: A European Perspective*. Routledge. 2017.
4. BIERMANN, F., BOAS, I. Preparing for a warmer world: Towards a global governance system to protect climate refugees. *Global Environmental Politics, 10*(1), 2010, p. 60–88.
5. DALBY, S. *Environmental Security*. Polity Press. 2014
6. DIACONU, L. Environmental Control Measures Regarding Public Health and Hygiene; in 6. International Mediteranean Congress, 13-15 August 2024 Roma/Italia, 2024, p.546-553. ISBN: 978-625-367-809-8.
7. DIACONU, L. Considerations About the Ecological Expertise and The Environmental Impact Assessment: In Compliance Elliance Journal (CEJ) Spring Edition Vol.10, nr.1, mai. Germania, Wiesbaden, 2024, p. 18-27. ISSN: 2365-3353
8. European Commission. *Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy (Water Framework Directive).* Official Journal of the European Communities, L327, 2000, p. 1–73.
9. European Environment Agency (EEA). *European waters: Assessment of*

status and pressures 2020. Copenhagen: EEA. 2020. https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/state-of-water (Visited in 01.12.2025).
10. European Environment Agency (EEA). *Water Quality in Europe: Assessment of Rivers, Lakes, and Groundwater.* Copenhagen: EEA. 2022.
11. FOLKE, C., CARPENTER, S., WALKER, B., SCHEFFER, M., ELMQVIST, T., GUNDERSON, L., HOLLING, C. S. Regime shifts, resilience, and biodiversity in ecosystem management. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics, 35*, 2004, p. 557–581.
12. FOLKE, C., CARPENTER, S., WALKER, B., SCHEFFER, M., CHAPIN, T., ROCKSTRÖM, J. Resilience Thinking: Integrating Resilience, Adaptability, and Transformability. *Ecology and Society, 15*(4), 2010, p. 20.
13. HOMER-DIXON, T. *Environment, Scarcity, and Violence.* Princeton University Press. 1999.
14. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). *Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report.* Geneva: IPCC. 2023.
15. KLINKE, A., RENN, O. The coming of age of risk governance. *Risk Analysis, 39*(4), 2019, p. 747–766.
16. MATTHEW, R., BARNETT, J., MCDONALD, B., O'BRIEN, K. Global environmental change and human security: An introduction. *Environmental Change and Security Program Report, 14*(1), 2010, p. 3–23.
17. MATTHEW, R., BARNETT, J., MCDONALD, B., O'BRIEN, K. *Global Environmental Change and Human Security.* MIT Press. 2010.
18. MEADOWCROFT, J. Greening the state. *Environmental Politics, 21*(6), 2012, p. 933–955.
19. OECD. *Environmental Governance in Europe: Lessons from Transboundary Cooperation.* Paris: OECD Publishing. 2021.
20. OSTROM, E. A general framework for analyzing sustainability. *Science, 325*(5939), 2009, p. 419–422.
21. PAHL-WOSTL, C. A conceptual framework for analyzing adaptive capacity and multi-level learning processes in resource governance regimes. *Global Environmental Change, 19*(3), 2009, p. 354–365.
22. SPRINCEAN, S. *Securitatea umană şi bioetica. Monografie*. Chișinău: F.E.P. "Tipografia Centrală". 2017, 304 p.
23. SPRINCEAN, S. *Simbioza securităţii şi interesele republcii moldova în perspectiva extinderii UE.* Republica Moldova în contextul noii arhitecturi de securitate regională : Materialele conferinţei ştiinţifice internaţionale, 24 mai 2024 / coord.: I. Coropcean; colegiul de redacţie: C. Manolache [et al.]. Chişinău: AMFA, 2025, p. 32-44.
24. SPRINCEAN, S. *Conceptual, methodological and bioethical perspectives of strengthening human security in Republic of Moldova.* În: Cross Border

Journal for International Studies / Universitatea „Dunărea de Jos” Galați. Vol. 2, nr. 4, 2017, p. 81-94.
25. SPRINCEAN, S. *Asigurarea securității umane prin fortificarea siguranței persoanei.* În: Sănătatea, medicina și bioetica în societatea contemporană: studii inter și pluridisciplinare. Materialele Conferinţei Ştiinţifice Internaţionale, USMF, Ediţia a 5-a, 7-8 octombrie 2022 / redactor responsabil și coordonator: Vitalie Ojovanu. Chișinău: Print-Caro, 2022, p. 97-103.
26. SPRINCEAN, S. *Development of conceptual apparatus of the contemporary security studies for better analysis of securing good governance and democracy*. In: Election Integrity and the Quality of Democracy: Challenges and Pathways to Good Governance. The work of the materials of the international scientific conference. / editors: Natalia Putină, Mariana Iaţco. Chișinău: CEP USM. 2025, p. 110-123.
27. SPRINCEAN, S. *Importanța securității umane în optimizarea politică și bioetică a managementului crizelor globale*. În: Political Science, International Relations and Security Studies. International Conference Proceedings. The Xth Edition. [Sibiu], 27-29 May 2016, p. 461-470.
28. SPRINCEAN, S. *Security of development into a knowledge-based society: Eastern European case*. In: Challenges, Processes, and Policies for a Circular Economy that Works for Consumers. ECO4ALL Mid-Term International Conference. Iași, 9-10 May 2025. Cost Action CA22124 ECO4ALL / Olesea Plotnic, Mihaela Tofan (editors). Iași: Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”. 2025, pp. 432-442.
29. SPRINCEAN, S. *Prioritățile de securitate națională prin prisma obiectivelor de securitate umană în contextul perspectivei de extindere a UE.* În: Conferința Internațională Jean Monnet “Mecanisme şi modele de adoptare a deciziilor la nivel local/regional/central”,19-20 aprilie 2024, Chișinău / Coord. L. Roşca. Chișinău: Print-Caro, 2024, p. 309-318.
30. SPRINCEAN, S. *Evoluția metodologiei de cercetare în studiile de securitate în contextul noilor provocări geopolitice*. În: Culegere de lucrări. Promovarea valorilor social-economice în contextul integrării europene. Conferința Științifică Internațională “Promovarea valorilor socialeconomice în contextul integrării europene”, Ediţia a 7-a din 6-7 decembrie 2024, Chişinău. / coordonatorul ediției: Șargu Lilia; comitetul științific: Sedlețchi Iurie (preşedinte). Chișinău: USEM (Pulsul Pieţei). 2025, p. 542-553.
31. SPRINCEAN, S. *Perspectives on Promoting Human Security Values under Conditions of Political Insecurity*. In: The sustainability of democracy under conditions of regional insecurity: International Collective Monograph / Moldova State University; coordinator: Ludmila Roşca. Chapter 6. Chișinău:Print-Caro. 2025, p. 180-212.

32. SPRINCEAN, S. *The importance of the inter-correlation between industrial symbiosis and security symbiosis for ensuring the macro-social sustainability*. In: Industrial Symbiosis from a business perspective: challenges and opportunities. Proceedings Book. WG2 Workshop & Conference. Izmir, May 21 2025. Yecla, Spain: Technological Centre of Furniture and Wood of the Region of Murcia (CETEM). COST Action CA22110 - LIAISE. 2025, p. 31-35.
33. SPRINCEAN, S. Dezvoltarea umană și siguranța persoanei în contextul preocupărilor pentru securitatea umană. In: *Studii şi cercetări juridice* / Institutul de Cercetări Juridice, Politice și Sociologice al USM; colegiul de redacție: Valeriu Cuşnir (coordonator ştiinţific) [et al.]. Chişinău: CEP USM, Partea 7-8. Subcap. 7.1. 2024, pp. 231-239.
34. SPRINCEAN, S. *Valențe conceptual-metodologice ale unor categorii și noțiuni specifice domeniului securității.* În: Conferința Internațională "Consolidarea rezilienței sociale prin valorificarea capitalului uman în contextul aderării Republicii Moldova și Ucrainei la Uniunea Europeană", 17-18 octombrie 2024, Chișinău / Coord. V. Mocanu. Chişinău: Editura USM, 2024, p. 219-226.
35. SPRINCEAN S. *Corelații ale problematicii siguranței persoanei și securității umane cu domeniul drepturilor omului.* În: *Studii și cercetări juridice* / Institutul de Cercetări Juridice, Politice și Sociologice; colegiul de redacție: Valeriu Cuşnir (coordonator ştiinţific) [et al.]. Chişinău: Institutul de Cercetări Juridice, Politice și Sociologice (F.E.-P. "Tipografia Centrală"). Partea a 6-a. Subcap. 7.1. 2023, p. 157-170.
36. SPRINCEAN, S. *Deepening human security and industrial symbiosis in the context of the EU enlargement*. In: Industrial Symbiosis from a technical perspective: challenges and opportunities. Proceedings Book. WG1 worskhop & conference, Bruxelles, September 10, 2024. Editors: Aleksandar Erceg, Josip Juraj Strossmayer, Pawel Krzeminski. Yecla, Spain: Technological Centre of Furniture and Wood of the Region of Murcia (CETEM). COST Action CA22110 Cooperation, development and cross-border transfer of Industrial Symbiosis among industry and stakeholders (LIAISE). 2024, p. 21-27.
37. SPRINCEAN, S. *Sustainability of public policies for strengthening personal safety and human security in conditions of political instability in the East-European region*. In: Evaluation of Policies on Social Inclusion, Migration, in particular interventions related to integration. The 2nd PROFEEDBACK Conference. 12-13 September 2022. PROFEEDbook2. COST Action CA20112 PlatfoRm OF policy Evaluation community for improvED EU policies and Better ACKnowledgement - PROFEEDBACK. University of Maribor, Slovenia. 2022, p. 156-164.

38. SPRINCEAN, S. *Aspecte etice în procesele electorale în perspectiva eficientizării instituțiilor puterii de stat*. În: Impactul sistemului electoral asupra capacității de funcționalitate a instituțiilor puterii de stat din Republica Moldova. / coord.: Victor Juc. Cap. 8. Chișinău: Tipografia Centrală, 2018, p. 118-130.
39. SPRINCEAN, S. *The Role of Human Security in Identifying New Perspectives of Development of the Education in the Field National Security*. În: Revista „Current and Future Perspectives on Teaching and Learning". Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918" din Alba-Iulia. Nr. 1 (1), 2019, p. 36-43.
40. SPRINCEAN, S. *Rolul securității umane în consolidarea sistemului național de securitate*. În: Interconexiunile integrării sociale și consolidarea sistemului național de securitate: Monografie colectivă. / Academia de Administrare Publică din Moldova; colegiul de redacție: Ludmila Roșca [et al.]. Chișinău: Print-Caro. Cap. 11. 2022, p. 329-359.
41. SPRINCEAN, S. *Perspective de fortificare a securității regionale în contextul aderării Republicii Moldova la Uniunea Europeană*. În: Conferința Internațională Jean Monnet: "Cooperarea instituţiilor statului în asigurarea unităţii naţionale". 28-29 martie 2025, Chişinău. / coordonator: Ludmila Roşca. Chişinău: Print-Caro, 2025, p. 73-86.
42. SPRINCEAN, S. *Unele stringențe și imperative în studiile contemporane de securitate*. În: Dezvoltarea cadrului juridic al Republicii Moldova în contextul necesităţilor de securitate şi asigurare a parcursului european. / Republica Moldova în contextul provocărilor interne şi externe la adresa securităţii naţionale (Partea a III-a). / Red. şt. Natalia Albu. Chişinău: Institutul de Cercetări Juridice, Politice şi Sociologice (ÎS FEP "Tipografia Centrală"). 2019. Cap. 1. (208 p.), p. 5-20.
43. SPRINCEAN, S. *Imperativul promovării securității umane în contextul procesului de integrare europeană a Republicii Moldova.* În: Republica Moldova în contextul oportunităților de modernizare: necesități de democratizare, securitate și cooperare. / coord.: Victor Juc. Cap. 10. Chișinău: Tipografia Centrală, 2016, p. 139-155.
44. SPRINCEAN, S. *Politici de asigurare a securității umane în condiții pandemice*. În: Top 10 probleme politice a societăţii în contextul pandemiei de coronavirus de tip nou. / red. şt. V. Juc. Chişinău: Institutul de Cercetări Juridice, Politice şi Sociologice (F.E.-P. "Tipografia Centrală"). Subcap. 2.5. 2022.
45. SPRINCEAN, S. *Insecuritatea umană în contextul securității naționale: oportunități de evaluare.* În: Riscuri și amenințări la adresa securității naționale: tehnici de analiză și evaluare. Ghid metodologic. / coord. N. Albu, V. Varzari, S. Sprincean. Chișinău: F.E.P. "Tipografia Centrală". 2019. Subcap. 3.5. (136 p.), p. 105-114.

46. SPRINCEAN, S. *Politica securității umane în Republica Moldova în contextul provocărilor și oportunităților mediului regional de securitate*. În: Dezvoltarea cadrului juridic al Republicii Moldova în contextul necesităților de securitate și asigurare a parcursului european. / red. șt. Valeriu Cușnir. Chișinău: Institutul de Cercetări Juridice, Politice și Sociologice (F.E.-P. "Tipografia Centrală"). Subcap. 5.2. 2019. (592 p.) p. 477-497.
47. SPRINCEAN, S. Importanța respectării intereselor și siguranței persoanei în contextul depășirii clivajelor macrosociale. In: *Educația și cercetarea în învățământul superior: realități și perspective*, Ed. 1, 1-2 iulie 2022, Chișinău. Chișinău, Republica Moldova: Universitatea de Studii Politice și Economice Europene "Constantin Stere", 2022, 1, pp. 160-165.
48. SPRINCEAN, S, LISNIC, V. Evaluarea impactului programelor-cadru și monitorizarea domeniului de cercetare și inovare. In: *Studia Universitatis Moldaviae (Seria Ştiinţe Sociale)*, 2025, nr. 3(183), p. 128-136.
49. SPRINCEAN, Serghei; PÎRŢAC, Grigore; SYCHEV, Andrey. *Human security and ethics in support for sustainable developmen*t. In: *Vector European*. 2022, nr. 1, pp. 38-42.
50. СПРИНЧАН, С. *Социо-политические аспекты выживания человечества в контексте эколого- и био- этической проблематики*. În: «Экологическая этика: сила этики для устойчивого развития». Коллективная монография. / Ред. Ниёле Васильевене, Агне Юрчюконите. 2010, Вильнюс: изд-во Университета Миколаса Ромериса, («Environmental Ethics: the Power of Ethics for Sustainable Development». Collective monograph / Eds. Nijolė Vasiljevienė, Agnė Jurčiukonytė. 2010, Vilnius: Mykolas Romeris University, p. 264-270.
51. СПРИНЧАН, С.; СЫЧЁВ, А.А. *Экологическая этика как форма интеграции естественнонаучного и гуманитарного знания*. В: Интеграция образования / Integration of Education. ФГБОУ ВПО «Мордовский государственный университет им. Н.П.Огарёва», г. Саранск, Республика Мордовия, РФ. Том 19, № 3. 2015 (июль - сентябрь), с. 100-107.
52. ЦЫРДЯ, Т. Н.; СПРИНЧАН, С. Л. *К вопросу о необходимости обоснования политической биоэтики.* În: Биоэтика (BIOETHICS). Федеральный научно-практический журнал. [Volgograd, Federația Rusă]. №2, 2014 (14), p. 13-17.
53. UNECE. *Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes: Guidance on water and adaptation to climate change.* United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. 2015.
54. UN Water. *Transboundary waters: Sharing benefits, sharing responsibilities.* Geneva: UN-Water. 2021.
55. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). *Making Peace with Na-*

ture: A Scientific Blueprint to Tackle the Climate, Biodiversity and Pollution Emergencies. Nairobi: UNEP. 2021.
56. WIERING, M., ARTS, B. Discourses on water policy: The implications for governance and management. *Ecological Economics, 59*(3), 2006, p. 229–241.
57. World Bank. *Enhancing resilience to climate change through improved water governance in Europe and Central Asia.* Washington, DC: World Bank. 2019.
58. World Bank. *Enhancing Climate Resilience in Eastern Europe and Central Asia: Policy and Institutional Approaches.* Washington, DC: World Bank Group. 2020.
59. YOUNG, O. R.. *The Institutional Dimensions of Environmental Change: Fit, Interplay, and Scale.* MIT Press. 2002.
60. YOUNG, O. R. *Governing Complex Systems: Social Capital for the Anthropocene.* MIT Press. 2017.
61. ZALASIEWICZ, J., WILLIAMS, M., HAYWOOD, A., ELLIS, M. The Anthropocene: A new epoch of geological time? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 369*(1938), 2011, p. 835–841.
62. ZIKOS, D., BAIRD, J. Climate change and transboundary water governance: Lessons from European river basins. *Environmental Policy and Governance, 31*(5), 2021, p. 341–356.